

Date: Fri, 29 Apr 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #187
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 29 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 187

Today's Topics:

[News] FCC Gets New Weapon (3 msgs)
FCC computers (2 msgs)
Homebrew 610 forms

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 28 Apr 1994 13:35:05 GMT
From: newsgate.melpar.esys.com!melpar!phb@uunet.uu.net
Subject: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

>mistaken licensee? I think a lot of people on those bands have no
>idea of what the rules really are.

Unfortunately, the same seems to be true for *some* of the
hams. A recent case I heard "through the grapevine" in the DC area
was of two local hams using split transmit & receive frequencies down
at the low end of 2 meters to have a "private" QSO. Nothing really
wrong with operating split frequency, *except* that one of them was
on 144.050 and one was on 144.650, and they wer both using FM voice.
144.0-144.1 is reserved for CW only; not only in the ARRL Band Plan,
but also in the FCC regulations. Somehow, they got caught (probably
a 2-meter EMEer who called the FCC), although I never heard what
happened.

IMHO, most hams who transgress do it *knowingly* and therefore should be subjected to harsher penalties than the poor dweeb who's led astray by the radio salesman. Maybe there should also be a penalty for the salesman/dealer who doesn't *actively* inform his customers of the rules...

 * Paul H. Bock, Jr. K4MSG * Senior Systems Engineer
(|_|) * E-Systems/Melpar Div. * Telephone: (703) 560-5000 x2062
| |) * 7700 Arlington Blvd. * Internet: pbock@melpar.esys.com
 * Falls Church, VA 22046 * Mailstop: N301

 "Never ascribe to a sinister motive
 that which is more likely due to stupidity."

Date: 28 Apr 1994 15:38:10 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
news.duke.edu!zombie.ncsc.mil!cs.umd.edu!newsfeed.gsfc.nasa.gov!
trmmstocker.gsfc.nasa.gov!stocker@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <phb.767540105@melpar> Paul H. Bock,
phb@syseng1.melpar.esys.com writes:

> IMHO, most hams who transgress do it *knowingly* and therefore
should
> be subjected to harsher penalties than the poor dweeb who's led astray
by
> the radio salesman. Maybe there should also be a penalty for the sales-
> man/dealer who doesn't *actively* inform his customers of the rules...
>

IMHO this view is what is wrong with this country to a very large measure. I don't know why someone else should be penalized for your transgressions. It isn't the salesperson's responsibility to ensure that you operate within the rules. It isn't his/her responsibility to ensure that you know the rules. You have the legal responsibility for finding out and complying with any transmission laws or regulations. The salesperson just has a legal obligation not to mislead you about the nature of the product or its use.

This is the same garbage that they have done to bartenders. Holding a bartender responsible for controlling the patron's drinking is stupid. We are all, once again, going to have to take responsibility for our own actions rather than finding others to blame.

* Erich Franz Stocker *
* N30XM *
* stocker@spso.gsfc.nasa.gov *
* *
* My ideas are my own and do not represent*
* the opinions of the federal government, *
* NASA or Goddard Space Flight Center. *

Date: 28 Apr 1994 21:32:46 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!transfer.stratus.com!
hoop.sw.stratus.com!northup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

phb@syseng1.melpar.esys.com (Paul H. Bock) writes:

:
: IMHO, most hams who transgress do it *knowingly* and therefore should
: be subjected to harsher penalties than the poor dweeb who's led astray by
: the radio salesman. Maybe there should also be a penalty for the sales-
: man/dealer who doesn't *actively* inform his customers of the rules...
:

Does this mean there should be a penalty for the salesman/dealer who
sold me my car everytime I get stopped for speeding ? I think not.

: * Paul H. Bock, Jr. K4MSG * Senior Systems Engineer
: (|_|) * E-Systems/Melpar Div. * Telephone: (703) 560-5000 x2062
: | |) * 7700 Arlington Blvd. * Internet: pbock@melpar.esys.com
: * Falls Church, VA 22046 * Mailstop: N301
:

: "Never ascribe to a sinister motive
: that which is more likely due to stupidity."
:

--
--

Bill Northup	PHONE: (508) 460-2085
Stratus Computer Inc.	INTERNET: northup@sw.stratus.com
55 Fairbanks Boulevard	Packet: N1QPR@WA1PHY.#EMS.MA.USA.NA
Marlboro, MA 01752	Amateur Radio: N1QPR

Date: Thu, 28 Apr 1994 12:13:53 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!ncar!csn!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!

hplextra!hplb!hpwin052!hpqmoea!dstock@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC computers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jim Grubs, W8GRT (jgrubs@voxbox.norden1.com) wrote:

: I don't know, but rumor has it the Smithsonian wants it when the
: FCC gets a new one. :)

: | Jim Grubs, W8GRT

Silly question..... with 12+ week delays etc, and thinking of the
phone bills generated by having to phone ARRL, VEC etc for permission
before phoning the FCC, would it be worthwhile for US amateurs, VECs and
the ARRL to raise funds for a modest PC with a moderately big disc and
volunteer-written software, and then *GIVE* it to the FCC as a donation ?

David GM4ZNX

Happy amateurs,
Happy FCC
Happy Smithsonian !

Date: Thu, 28 Apr 1994 19:40:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!
col.hp.com!srngenprp!alanb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FCC computers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

David Stockton (dstock@hpqmoca.sqf.hp.com) wrote:
: Jim Grubs, W8GRT (jgrubs@voxbox.norden1.com) wrote:

: : I don't know, but rumor has it the Smithsonian wants it when the
: : FCC gets a new one. :)

: Silly question..... with 12+ week delays etc, and thinking of the
: phone bills generated by having to phone ARRL, VEC etc for permission
: before phoning the FCC, would it be worthwhile for US amateurs, VECs and
: the ARRL to raise funds for a modest PC with a moderately big disc and
: volunteer-written software, and then *GIVE* it to the FCC as a donation ?

I wouldn't help unless we were willing to put in a major effort to re-write

the software to go with it. It's the same problem NASA has with the space shuttle. Sure, the computer hardware is woefully out-of-date, but a new computer would require rewriting and then re-flight-qualifying the software. A serious software bug in the FCC's computer wouldn't be QUITE as disastrous as one in the space shuttle, but it wouldn't be too nifty either.

There are reliability questions as well. I'm very sensitive to this having had a hard disc crash on my PC a few weeks ago :=(

It still might make sense for ARRL to buy the FCC a high-reliability computer and hire a professional programmer to write them some software.

AL N1AL

Date: 28 Apr 1994 23:31:34 UTC
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!psgrain!quack!quack.kfu.com!
nsayer@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Homebrew 610 forms
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

bill@triangle.cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshannon) writes:

>I like it. When can I have the other side??

V1.0, which I just posted, is an obsolete version of the form. A couple of people have offered me and at least one is sending me a new copy of the current form. Post office willing, v2.0 should be out this weekend, with both sides.

Throw away v1.0 though. The FCC won't take it (especially since it has no back).

--
Nick Sayer <nsayer@quack.kfu.com> |
N6QQQ @ N0ARY.#NOCAL.CA.USA.NOAM | "I love animals. They're delicious."
+1 408 249 9630, log in as 'guest' |
PGP 2.2 key and geek code via finger | -- Fred Barnes

Date: 27 Apr 94 23:36:12 EST
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
cis.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!ohstpy.mps.ohio-state.edu!miavx1!
miavx3.mid.muohio.edu!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Apr20.193002.3527@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<042294021743Rnf0.77b9@amcomp.com>, <2pkeke\$nv@d.vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com>o-stat
Subject : Re: "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading

In article <2pkeke\$nv@d.vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com>, montp@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com (Mont
Pierce) writes:

>>kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>>

>>>When a "codeless" tech "upgrades" to TECH plus 5WPM code, he simply

>>>gets a CSCE for the 5WPM. No forms get sent to the FCC. At least

>>>not when I upgraded. I was told to just save the form in case

>>>someone asked to see it.

>>>

>>>Also, when I received my license (March of 1993) there was no

>>>indication other than TECHNICIAN with PRIMARY privileges. (Will

>>>this change for future technicians?)

>>>

>>>So...what is to prevent a codeless tech from operating 10 meter

>>>SSB?

>>

>

> Or cw on any Novice band, for that matter.

>

> In all the databases I've seen I've never seen any indication of any

> kind that you could use to distinguish between a Tech and Tech+ unless

> they upgraded from Novice to Tech+.

>

> So, unless your going to confront each Tech and ask for their CSCE you

> would never know if they upgraded from Tech to Tech+ or not...

>

> If the FCC can tell, then they must be looking at some field other than

> class of license.

>

> 73,

>

> km6wt

>

We are being told that the FCC will begin issuing "TECHNICIAN PLUS" licenses
after March 1, 1994. In another post, the writer indicated that the FCC will
issue the new "TECHNICIAN PLUS" to all who qualify and ask for it.

The new designation will be automatic on renewal.

How about a comment from the ARRL/VEC or W5YI/VEC to clairify this question.

73 >< Carl

K8NHE

??? See ya at Dayton this year ???

Date: Fri, 29 Apr 1994 06:53:07 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!modem60.ucdavis.edu!
ddtodd@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cot5KH.G0E@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <Cotp3M.CvL@world.std.com>,
<phb.767540105@melpar>vis.edu
Subject : Re: [News] FCC Gets New Weapon

phb@syseng1.melpar.esys.com (Paul H. Bock) writes:

> IMHO, most hams who transgress do it *knowingly* and therefore should
>be subjected to harsher penalties than the poor dweeb who's led astray by
>the radio salesman. Maybe there should also be a penalty for the sales-
>man/dealer who doesn't *actively* inform his customers of the rules...

I think it is wrong (if even possible) to punish based on intentions. If there is a different penalty for the same transgression based on the knowledge of the perpetrator do you really think anyone will admit to knowing the rules at the time of the transgression? The idea of holding the salesman responsible for the actions of an idiot is unfortunately becoming more and more common. I suppose that the Menedez brothers will get off but the guy who sold them the shotguns will go to jail. That is exactly the kind of logic that has caused some of the problems we are now seeing wrt the lack of personal responsibility. It seems that people are trying to find a way to shirk responsibility in our society but they don't realize that they are giving up rights every day as they are avoiding their responsibilities.

cheers,
Dan

=====
Dan Todd ddtodd@ucdavis.edu kc6uud@ke6lw.#nocal.ca.us.na
Charter Member: Dummies for UNIX

When radios are outlawed, only outlaws will have radios
- David R. Tucker on rec.radio.amateur.policy
=====

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #187
